

Application No. 09/707,923

## REMARKS

The Office Action of **April 7, 2004** has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-8, 10-18 and 21-28 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 4, 12, and 14 are independent claims.

This Amendment amends claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, 14, cancels claims 9 and 19-20, and adds claims 21-28. Claims 1 and 10 were amended to incorporate limitations of now canceled claim 9. Claims 4 and 14 were amended to incorporate limitations of claims 1 and 12, respectively, before being amended. Support for elements not previously or fully recited in the claims is found in the Applicant's specification at: paragraphs starting at lines 18 (re claims 21, 23, 25, and 27) on page 2, and paragraphs starting at lines 5 (re claims 1 and 12) and 23 (re claims 22, 24, 26, and 28) on page 5.

In addition, this Amendment amends the specification to correct two typographical errors and to rephrase an expression.

No new matter is therefore believed to be introduced by these amendments.

### 1. Acknowledgement For Receipt Of Formal Drawings Requested

The Office Action Summary (at point 10) does not indicate whether the formal drawings mailed by Applicant April 11, 2002 to the Chief Draftsperson have been received and/or have been accepted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests receiving in a future correspondence acknowledgment of receipt of the formal drawings mailed by Applicant so that in the event they were not received (or not accepted) Applicant may submit a new copy (or corrected copy) of the formal drawings.

### 2. Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 101

The Office Action starting on page 2 rejects claims 12-18 under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response thereto Applicant amends claim 12 to tie claimed functionality to a computer environment. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 12-18 under 35 USC 101 is now believed to be overcome.

### 3. Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102

The Office Action starting on page 3 rejects claims 1-20 under 35 USC 102(b)

Application No. 09/707,923

as being anticipated over Mclan et al., US Patent No. 6,130,968 (hereinafter referred to as "Mclan"). In response thereto Applicant amends the claims as set forth above to more clearly set forth in the claims the embodiments of Applicant's invention.

Mclan discloses a high speed display and method for enhancing the readability of rapidly displayed text, "in which a body of the text containing words previously read is displayed in a [secondary] window separated from a [word display] window in which words are sequentially and rapidly presented" (see column 3, lines 1-4 of Mclan, emphasis added; also see column 4, lines 53-58). In one embodiment, the secondary window is generated only "when the high speed display is stopped" (see column 8, lines 33-34 of Mclan, emphasis added). In another embodiment, a word displayed in the word display window is added to the secondary window only "after the word is displayed" in the word display window (see column 9, lines 9-11 of Mclan, emphasis added). "In this way, a reader of the text may be reading the text in the rapidly changing display in that window at a high rate of speed and may also scan previously read words in the body of text." (See column 4, lines 61-65 of Mclan).

In contrast, Applicant's embodiments recited in independent claims 1, 4, 12, and 14 are directed at apparatuses and methods therefor for rapidly reading text on a display adapted to, for example, a small portable device in which a display controller controls text displayed in a first region, in which words are presented sequentially one after another in time, and a thumbnail view, in which a section of the text is presented from which the words in the first region are being read. Unlike Mclan which enables reading in one window while being able to review previously read words in another, Applicant enables reading from a first region while being able to see an approximate location within a thumbnail view the word currently presented in the first region.

That is, Mclan, as set forth above, fails to disclose or suggest as claimed by Applicant a display controller that either controls movement of a thumbnail view or movement of an indicator to indicate the position in a selection of text of the current word displayed in a word display region. More specifically, in a first embodiment recited in independent claims 1 and 12, the display controller controls movement of a thumbnail view relative to a first region to indicate at least an approximate location within a thumbnail view of the word currently presented in the first region; and in a

Application No. 09/707,923

second embodiment recited in independent claims 4 and 14, the display controller controls, as words are presented in a first region sequentially one after another in time, movement of an indicator having a position within a thumbnail view, where the position of the indicator corresponds to the position in the section of text of the word currently displayed in the first region.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 4, 12, and 14 as amended are patentably distinguishable over McIn. Insofar as claims 2-3, 5-8, 10-11, 13, 15-18, and 21-28 are concerned, these claims depend from one of now presumably allowable independent claims 1, 4, 12, and 14 and are also believed to be in allowable condition.

#### 4. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiner considers a personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is hereby requested to call Attorney for Applicant(s), Thomas Zell.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Zell

Thomas Zell  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 37,481  
Telephone: 650-812-4282  
Date: 7/7/04